



SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<u>WPCRL/1072/2026</u> Sushant Mandal And Ors Petitioners Versus State Of Uttarakhand and Others Respondents <u>Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.</u> Mr. Lalit Sharma and Ms. Suraiya Naaz, learned counsel for the petitioners. 2. Mr. Akshay Latwal, learned A.G.A. along with Mr. Manoj Bhatt, learned Brief Holder for the State. 3. Mr. Vivek Sanguri, learned counsel for respondent nos.3 & 4. 4. By means of the present criminal writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners seek issuance of a writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari for quashing the Case Crime/F.I.R. No. 0067 of 2026 dated 04.05.2026 registered under Sections 109, 115(2) and 191 (2) of the B.N.S. at Police Station Dineshpur, District Udham Singh Nagar, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom. 5. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the impugned F.I.R. has been lodged alleging, inter alia, that during a marriage ceremony, petitioner no.2 entered into an altercation with respondent no.4 on the dance floor and, thereafter, when respondent no.4 came outside the venue,



		the petitioners allegedly assaulted him with sticks, tiles and sharp-edged weapons, causing injuries on his head and other parts of the body. 6. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the incident in question arose out of a sudden altercation during a marriage function and that, during the pendency of the present writ petition, the parties have amicably settled their disputes. It is contended that no useful purpose would be served by permitting the criminal proceedings to continue in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties. 7. It is further submitted that a Compounding Application, being I.A. No. 1 of 2026, duly supported by separate affidavits sworn by the petitioners as well as respondent nos.3 and 4, has been filed before this Court. In the said application, the parties have categorically stated that they have voluntarily resolved all their disputes and differences without any coercion, pressure or undue influence and that they do not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings any further. 8. Learned State Counsel would oppose the prayer for quashing. However, he does not dispute the factum of filing of the compromise application nor the presence of the parties before this Court. 9. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent nos.3 and 4 fairly submits that the dispute between the parties has been amicably resolved and that respondent nos.3 and 4 have no objection if the impugned F.I.R. and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed in view of the compromise arrived at between the
--	--	--



			parties. 10. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that petitioner no.1 is present in person before the Court, whereas petitioner nos.2 to 5, who are presently languishing in Sub-Jail, Haldwani, District Nainital, have joined the proceedings through Video Conferencing. 11. Petitioner no.1 is present in person before the Court. Petitioner nos.2 to 5 are present through Video Conferencing from Sub-Jail, Haldwani, District Nainital. Respondent nos.3 and 4 are also present in person and have been duly identified by their respective learned counsel. 12. Upon interaction with the Court, respondent no.4, the injured person, stated that he does not wish to pursue the matter any further. He further stated that the incident occurred during a marriage function where, due to overcrowding on the dance platform, he accidentally fell and sustained injuries on his head after coming into contact with a sharp edge of the stage. He further stated that he has no grievance against the petitioners and has no objection if the impugned F.I.R. and all consequential proceedings are quashed. 13. Respondent no.3, the informant, also stated before the Court that the F.I.R. came to be lodged due to a misunderstanding and that the dispute has now been amicably resolved. Both respondent nos.3 and 4 have unequivocally stated that they have entered into the compromise voluntarily, of their own free will and without any coercion, inducement or undue influence. 14. Heard learned counsel for the parties
--	--	--	--



			and perused the material available on record. The parties, who are present before the Court, have affirmed the terms of settlement and have expressed their desire to bring the litigation to an end. 15. The legal position governing the exercise of writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for quashing criminal proceedings on the basis of compromise is no longer res integra. In <i>Gian Singh v. State of Punjab</i>, (2012) 10 SCC 303, <i>Narinder Singh v. State of Punjab</i>, (2014) 6 SCC 466 and <i>State of Madhya Pradesh v. Laxmi Narayan</i>, (2019) 5 SCC 688, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the High Court may, in exercise of its extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India and inherent jurisdiction to secure the ends of justice, quash criminal proceedings arising out of personal or private disputes where the parties have amicably settled their differences and where continuation of the proceedings would amount to an abuse of the process of law, provided that the offences are not of a heinous nature or such as have a serious impact upon society at large. 16. In the present case, the dispute arises out of an incident which appears to be personal in nature. The injured as well as the informant have appeared before this Court and have categorically stated that they have settled their disputes with the petitioners and do not wish to prosecute the matter any further. The compromise entered into between the parties appears to be genuine, voluntary and free from any coercion or undue influence. In the peculiar facts and
--	--	--	---



			circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered view that the possibility of securing a conviction is remote and bleak and that continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose. 17. Accordingly, the Compounding Application (I.A. No. 1 of 2026) is allowed. 18. Consequently, the F.I.R./Case Crime No. 0067 of 2026 dated 04.05.2026, registered at Police Station Dineshpur, District Udham Singh Nagar, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed. 18. It is stated that petitioner nos.2 to 5 are presently in judicial custody in connection with the aforesaid case. In view of the quashing of the impugned F.I.R. and all consequential proceedings, they shall be released forthwith, if their custody is not required in connection with any other case. 19. The criminal writ petition is accordingly allowed. 20. Pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed of accordingly. MA MTA RANI Digitally signed by MAMTA RANI DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND, ou=HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND, 2.5.4.20=6a812005bebf46f244f3e584af1449e430ef900bf09a6d67ebbd642671329b, postalCode=263001, st=Uttarakhand, serialNumber=5de1751a4f1d9cabfd54852c9e68911ca8b66dd26690a191648ab5d8dd004ef0, cn=MAMTA RANI Date: 2026.07.14 17:19:49 +05'30' (Alok Mahra, J.) 14.07.2026
--	--	--	---

Mamta